The Appeal of Fear as a Rhetorical/Persuasive Strategy in Legitimizing the American War on Iraq

Instructor Ali Salman Hummadi
Department of the English Language/College of Arts/University of Anbar
2009

Abstract

This paper discusses how the appeal of fear has been exploited by George W. Bush in his presidential speeches given between September 2002 and March 2003 to legitimize the American war on Iraq. Bush depended on deception, misleading, propaganda and false pretensions presented to his audience that contributed to the emergence and hegemony of the discourse of "the Iraqi growing threat and danger". The paper examines, in particular, the discursive and linguistic means of deceptions and misleading by which the appeals of fear, represented by "the growing threats and dangers", have been realized and have taken great influence to persuade audience of the necessity and obligation of the American future intervention in Iraq as the last option to stop "the growing threats and dangers" to America. These threats and dangers have been realized by the collocation of the Iraqi policy, alleged Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and alleged Iraq's connection to terrorist groups who, as it is presented in Bush's speeches, "would not hesitate to use them against America". Thus, in his efforts to get hegemony of the discourse of the inevitability of the American war against Iraq to stop the Iraqi "threat" and "danger" to America, Bush, through his political speech, shifts from describing Iraq's past actions, into describing the

alleged present Iraq's "growing threats" that "may" or "will" take place in future if not preemptive war against Iraq will take place, into the necessity and obligation of the American war to stop the "world of fear". In other words, and to legitimize the war against Iraq, Bush argues from "is" to "must" and "will", from "description" concerning Iraq to "prescription" of policy to put the audience in a frame of mind that makes them more receptive to an immediate or future course of action.

1. Introduction

Abuaisha (2003: 62) (Cited in www.law.ed.ac.uk/ahrc/files/72gibsonculturaldiversitybiodiversity03.pdf) states language has great efforts on the way we think where it is the means by which we can view the world in both "(re)production and interpretation, shaping our beliefs and perception". Political language is characterized of containing "structures of domination and legitimation".These structures achieve specific political goals. Politicians manipulate language to achieve their political goals and they operate on two levels of communication: "one intends to persuade and to communicate with fellow politicians and journalists; the other communicates with and tries to convince the public" (ibid).

Dunmire (2007:22) states that political actors, through producing their political discourse, potentially entail ideological implications of the future orientation. He argues that "political discourse exerts power by projecting deterministic representation that render particular future scenarios as known and inevitable – as future reality". Fairclough (2000) (Cited in Dunmire, ibid) states that the "power of discourse favoring globalization derives from the fact that they render globalization as an inevitable, natural phenomenon developing outside human deliberation, design or resistance". Similarly, in our study, the power of discourses favoring the American war on Iraq derives from

the fact that they render war as inevitable natural phenomenon to stop the "growing threats and dangers" posed by the Iraqi policy, alleged Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and the alleged Iraq's connection to terrorist groups. Thus, Bush deceives, misleads and manipulates audience by this frequent collocation to plant fear in them. Such type of fear, as it is presented by Dunmire, (2007:38) mentally models the audience to accept the American military future action "by intensifying the negative associations" the audience has regarding Iraq. In turn, these fear appeals provoke the negative feelings of audience towards Iraq and have them accept, without challenge, the American war against Iraq. Thus, Deception and misleading are the means that Bush depended on to intensify the appeals of fear for achieving decisive political goals.

2. Analysis

This paper, to analyze the data of study, depended on work within critical discourse analysis (CDA). The analysis depended, in particular, on Aristotle's Rhetoric (the concept of fear and his three divisions of rhetoric, presented in 3.1. and 3.2.) (Cited in Richardson 2007:161), and on Fairclough's argument from "is" to "must" or from "descriptions of world or world change to prescription of policy" (www.ling. lancs.ac.uk/staff/norman/Blair.doc, P.3). Discourse is considered an important means that is used by social actors to exert power and control (Dunmire 2007:23). Dunmire also sees that discourse is the means by which we can understand the different relations of power embedded within discourses and "relatedly, the ways discourses function to exert social and political control".

As for critical discourse analysis (CDA), Abuaisha (2003:63) cited in (www.law.ed.ac.uk/ahrc/files/72_gibsonculturaldiversitybiodiversity03.pdf) states that CDA is "an

interdisciplinary tool that express inequality and injustice". He quotes several definitions of CDA for several discourse analysts: Ruth Wodak writes that “[CDA] chooses the perspective of those who suffer most and critically analyses those in power, those who are responsible, and those who have the means and the opportunity to solve such problems”. Norman Fairclough has said: “CDA in its very aims seeks to reveal the structures, locations and effects of power”. Van Dijk sees CDA as operating on two levels, the micro and macro: “Language use, discourse, verbal interaction and communication belong to the micro-level of the social order. Power, dominance and inequality between social groups are typically terms that belong to a macro-level of analysis”.

3. Discussion

3.1.The Appeal of Fear and Discourse of "threats" and "dangers"

Richardson (2007: 160) considers fear as a way of persuasion achieved through pathos which are excited explicitly or implicitly in an argument. Audience can be moved from one emotional state to another through pathos which are intentionally used in an argument as a rhetorical means: "pathetic arguments may move an audience to anger (or pity, fear, etc.); alternatively, pathetic argument can be used to calm an audience down". Thus, through his use of pathetic argumentation, the arguer tries to put the audience in a certain mental state that has them ready to accept what the arguer wants them to believe. Dunmire (2007:38) agrees that appeals of fear should be used in such a way to help to arouse "the audience negative feelings towards the enemy". Richardson (2007:106) goes further to state that people, when happy, give judgments about situations different from when they are pained. He makes this clear when he quotes from Aristotle: " our judgments when are pleased and friendly are not the same as when we are pained and hostile".

As far as political discourse is concerned, fear "currently dominates political discourse, especially on foreign policy" (Richardson 2007:106). As Aristotle states:

> **If fear is associated with the expectation that something destructive will happen to us, plainly nobody will be afraid who believes nothing can happen to him […] consequently, when it is advisable that the audience should be frightened, the orator must make them feel that they really are in danger of something, pointing out that it has happened to others who were stronger than they are, and is happening, or has happened, to people like themselves, at the hands of unexpected people, in an unexpected form, and at an unexpected time" (ibid).**

Thus, in his presidential speeches, Bush heavily depends on the theme of "threat" and "danger" which, according to Dunmire (2007:26) functions as a way of legitimizing future intentions within the post 9/11 context "as they rhetorically justify official action in terms of the "rights and duties". So, we see that Bush helps, in his rhetoric, in having the appeal of fear do its rhetorical function well through the construction or emergence of the discourse or theme of "threats" and "dangers" which is in itself joined to another type of discourse of "threat", in this case alleged Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction and alleged Iraq's connection to terrorists groups who, as it is presented in Bush's speeches, "would not hesitate to use them against America". Thus, as it is made by Van Dijk (2005:85), the "threat' and "danger" of international terrorism turned to be the base on which "the security policy" of Bush and other political actors heavily depend especially when the argument of the discourse is tied to the deceived and misled

information of the alleged weapons of mass destruction. He goes further to present that "the topic of terrorism threat is thus becoming a standard argument that needs no further proof, that is topos, that can be used in any argument, for instance to increase defense spending, engaging in a war and to curtail human rights – all in order to enhance security". According to Kaufer and Butler 1996 (Cited in Dunmire (2007:34), the discourse or the theme of "threat" rhetorically functions through constructing a particular channel between a speaker and an audience concerning future actions. They argue that, by the discourse or the theme of "threat", the speaker colors the situation at present with negative future results or consequences if an immediate or future action does not take place. Dunmire (2007:35) adds that "this vision of the future, in turn, obligates the audience to take support actions that will present the speakers' opponents from getting rein on the future". The following excerpts show the efforts exerted by Bush as a political actor to put his audience in a situation of fear by alerting the audience to the closeness or imminence of "threat' and "danger" posed by Iraq or Iraqi policy and the alleged Iraq's weapons of mass destruction which can be easily passed to terrorist groups. By this rhetoric, Cap (www.geocities.com/strus pl/Legitimization_ Introduction.pdf, P.3) points out that Bush urges America and the world to take an immediate action. He (ibid: 3-4) adds that "the speaker solicits approval of his actions by placing the addressee close to the source of threat" or alternatively, by picturing the threat as close to the addressee as it is clear in the following excerpts:

1. ***By supporting terrorist groups, repressing its own people, and pursuing weapons of mass destruction in defiance of a decade of U.N. resolutions, Iraqi regime has proven itself a grave and gathering danger. To suggest otherwise is to hope against the evidence.***

(September 14, 2002)

2. ***The danger*** *to our country is grave, and it is growing.* ***The Iraqi regime*** *possesses* ***biological and chemical weapons****, is rebuilding the facilities to make more and, according to the British Government, could launch* ***a biological or chemical attack*** *in as little as 45 minutes after the order is given.* ***The regime*** *has longstanding and continuing ties to* ***terrorist groups****, ….* ***This regime*** *is seeking* ***a nuclear bomb*** *and with fissile material could build one within a year.*

(September 28, 2002)

3. ***The danger*** *to America from* ***the Iraqi regime*** *is grave and growing.* ***The regime*** *is guilty of beginning two wars. It has a horrible history of striking without warning. In defiance of pledges to the United Nations,* ***Iraq*** *has* ***stockpiled biological and chemical weapons*** *and is rebuilding the facilities used to make more of* ***those weapons****.* ***Iraq*** *has used* ***these weapons of death*** *against innocent Iraqi people, and we have every reason to believe it will use them again.*

(October 5, 2002)

4. *One of* ***the greatest dangers*** *we face is that* ***weapons of mass destruction*** *might be passed to* ***terrorists*** *who would not hesitate to use* ***those weapons****.* ***Iraq*** *has longstanding, direct, and continuing ties to* ***terrorist networks****.*

(February, 8 2003)

5. *America is determined to enforce the demands of the United Nations Security Council by confronting* ***the grave and growing danger of Iraq and its weapons of mass destruction****.* ***Iraqi regime*** *will not be allowed to intimidate and blackmail the civilized world or to supply* ***its terrible weapons to terrorist groups*** *who would not hesitate to use*

them against us. The safety of the American people depends on ending <u>this threat</u>.

(March 1, 2003)

In these and other examples, Bush heavily depends on the connection between Iraq or Iraqi policy, the alleged weapons of mass destruction and terrorist groups and networks. Whenever Bush mentions "threat" or "danger", it is considered as a topic sentence containing the controlling idea which needs to be completely developed (through joining "threat" to Iraqi authorities and weapons of mass destruction) to be persuasively and rhetorically effective in putting his audience in a state of mind making them more receptive to an immediate or future actions America takes to stop this threat. This is also evidenced when Dunmire (2007: 27) quotes from Chilton (2003) "that "threat" has future actions as one of its felicity conditions". He (ibid) adds that "threat" represents a source from which political actors borrow lexical and syntactic structures helping the public to imagine and plan the future as Bush does in his speeches (See chapter 2). Thus, instead of talking about fear implicitly, Bush explicitly declares that they refuse to live in a future of fear as this is clear in the following two excerpts:

6. ***The issue is straightforward: <u>we must choose between a world of fear or a world of progress</u>.***

(September 14, 2002)

7. ***<u>We refuse to live in this future of fear</u>. We are determined to build a future of security and peace for ourselves and for the world.***

(September 28, 2002)

Thus, Bush makes audience compare between living in future in which America takes military action against Iraq to

ensure a future of security and safety to American people or America chooses not to do any thing to stop the threat and to live in a future in which America people are threatened with close and imminent destruction. This is also evidenced in the following excerpt:

8. The dangers we face will only worsen from month to month and year to year. <u>To ignore these threats is to encourage them, and when they have fully materialized, it may be too late to protect ourselves and our allies. By then, Iraq will have had the means to terrorize and dominate the region, and each passing day could be the one on which the Iraqi regime gives anthrax or VX nerve gas or, someday, a nuclear weapon to a terrorist group.</u>

September 28, 2002

Returning to Aristotle's statement concerning the concept of fear (Cited in Richardson 2007: 160) and focusing on some of its parts (See the complete quotation in page 4),

> **… pointing out that <u>it has happened to others</u> who were <u>stronger</u> than they are, and <u>is happening</u>, or has happened, <u>to people like themselves</u>, at the hands of <u>unexpected people</u>, in an <u>unexpected form</u>, and at an <u>unexpected time</u>".**

we see that, after giving many descriptions of the size and imminence of the "threat" and "danger" posed Iraq or and its alleged weapons of mass destruction, and the threat of terrorism that America and the world face, and to apply Aristotle's quotation to Bush's speeches, Bush confirms that the danger of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction "<u>has happened to others</u>" as it is clear in the excerpts below. Thus, Bush rhetorically exploits the lexical and syntactic structures that the discourse of "threat" makes available to

make the "threat" of the Iraqi authorities and their alleged weapons of mass destruction look true.

8. Iraq has already used weapons of mass death against another country and against its own citizens.

(September 28, 2002)

9. In defiance of pledges to the United Nations, Iraq has stockpiled biological and chemical weapons and is rebuilding the facilities used to make more of those weapons. Iraq has used these weapons of death against innocent Iraqi people, and we have every reason to believe Iraq will use them again.

(October 5, 2002)

In these excerpts and others, Bush argues by narrative and/or descriptive example which is in itself a means of persuasion (Connor and Gladkov 2004: 275). They state "this means of persuasion corresponds to the process of induction and induction is the basis of all reasoning". By induction, they consider a particular case as a source for general assumptions (Connor and Gladkov 2004: 275). Thus, we see that, in his presidential speeches, Bush reveals that the "threat" or the destruction of weapons of mass "has happened" to another country and also "has happened" to Iraqi people themselves. By this narrative/ descriptive example, Bush intensifies the effect of the fear appeal by "conversationally implicating that the number of this type of events or threatening actions is actually bigger than just one" (Al-Mahdawi & Hummadi 2009: 7). Other more examples are as follows:

10. The world is also uniting to answer the unique and urgent threat posed by Iraq, that has already used weapons of mass destruction to kill thousands.

(November 23, 2002)

11. <u>The attacks of September the 11th, 2001, showed what the enemies of America did with four airplanes.</u>

(March 8, 2003)

12. As diplomatic efforts continue, we must never lose sight of the basic facts about the regime of Baghdad. We know from recent <u>history that Iraq has twice invaded his neighbors without provocation, wars that led to death and suffering on a massive scale.</u>

(March 15, 2003)

After alerting the audience that something very dangerous "<u>has happened</u>" to other people, Bush shifts to alert them that something destructive "<u>is happening</u>" or "may happen" by "<u>an unexpected people</u>" as it is shown in the following excerpts:

13. One of the greatest dangers we face is that weapons of mass destruction might be passed to <u>terrorists</u> who would not hesitate to use those weapons.

(February,15 2005)

14. The war on terror is an ongoing activity for our Nations. We will take every measure that is necessary to protect the American people from <u>terrorists groups and outlaw regimes</u>.

15. These recent threats are a stark reminder that our country remains engaged in a war on terror. Our enemies are still determined to attack America, and there is no such thing as perfect security against <u>a hidden network of killers</u>.

(February 15, 2003)

where in these excerpts, Bush uses general names without limiting them to certain people or certain countries. By this, audience will infer that Iraq does not represent a direct "threat" to America and the world due to the big distance between Iraq and America. Bush provokes his audience to implicate that the source of the direct "threat" to America may come from terrorists, inside America or outside the borders, having connection to the Iraqi regime which represents a threat through passing terrorist groups weapons of mass destruction that will be used against America. Thus, according to Aristotle (Cited in Richardson 2007: 160), the audience, by being frightened, will accept, without challenge, any future military plans or actions against Iraq to stop this fearful future.

And then, Bush shifts to confirm that the "threat" and 'danger" "<u>is happening</u>" or may happen in "<u>an unexpected form</u>" at "<u>an unexpected time</u>" as in the following excerpts:

16. The danger to our country is grave, and it is growing. The Iraqi regime possesses biological and chemical weapons, is rebuilding the facilities to make more and, according to the British Government<u>, could launch a biological or chemical attack in as little as 45 minutes after the order is given.</u>

***in as little as 45 minutes* = unexpected time of destruction**

(September 28, 2002)

Here, Bush alerts his audience of the closeness of the danger without giving a limited date/time when the attack may happen. In saying "in as little as 45 minutes after the order is given", Bush just identifies the period of the attack leaving the audience implicate that the order will be given at any time from now.

17. The attacks of September the 11th, 2001, showed what the enemies of America did with four airplanes. We will not wait to see what terrorists or terror states could do with weapons of mass destruction. We are determined to confront "threat" wherever they arise.

(March 8, 2003)

In excerpt (17), Bush evokes the horrible destruction that "happened to" America with four airplanes. And then, by flouting the maxim of manner through using the words (wait – what), Bush evokes the notion that what the enemies of America can do with weapons of mass destruction may happen at "unexpected time" and in a "form" that is more horrible than the attacks of September 11th , 2001 (Thomas 1995). Even by using the plural form of "enemy", Bush presupposes that there is not just one enemy to America (in this case Iraq, as the intention of the speech is to legitimize the war against Iraq), but there are others that Iraq my have connections and ties with and may pass them weapons of mass destruction where this is evidenced when, by using "enemies", he flouts the maxim of manner through using an ambiguous utterance to mean exactly what he had already presupposed (ibid). See more excerpts expressing Bush's discourse of "unexpected time" and "unexpected form" of destruction.

18. Yet, I assure you that our government at every level is responding to this threat, working to track down every lead and standing watch 24 hours a day against terrorism.

standing watch 24 hours a day = unexpected time of destruction

(February 15, 2003)

19. The FBI, CIA, Department of Homeland Security, and Department of Defense are working together as never

before to assemble and analyze the threat information so we can act before our enemies can strike us.

before our enemies can strike us = unexpected time of destruction

(February 15, 2003)

20. Raising the threat level also informs the general public to be more alert to their surroundings and prepared for possible emergencies in the event of an attack.

for possible emergencies in the event of an attack = unexpected form of destruction.

(February 15, 2003)

21. Our Nation is preparing for a variety of threats we hope never will arrive. Many of these dangers are unfamiliar and unsettling. Yet the best way to fight these dangers is to anticipate them and act against them with focus and determination.

a variety of threats/ unfamiliar and unsettling = unexpected form of destruction

(February 15, 2003)

22. And we must recognize that some threats are so grave and their potential consequences so terrible that they must be removed, even if it requires military force.

their potential consequences so terrible = unexpected form of destruction

(February 15, 2003)

In excerpt (21), Bush warns audience that the form of destruction can not be expected and that it is unfamiliar and unsetting. And in excerpt (22), he warns the audience of terrible consequences of the threat or destruction. Thus, by this rhetoric (the absence of the exact time and form of destruction), Bush has audience anticipate present or future threats and that they must act against them to fight and stop these threats as it is clear in excerpt (21) *Yet the best way to fight these dangers is to anticipate them and act against them with focus and determination.*

Thus, according to Aristotle's theory of fear (Cited in Richardson 2007: 160), Bush succeeds in frightening the audience through having them feel that "they are really in the danger of something". Similar to Aristotle's theory is Chilton's (2004) concept of proximization, Cited in Cap (www.geocities.com/strus_pl/Legitimization_Introduction.pdf, P.3). Cap argues that the concept of proximization has been developed "to account for situations in which the speaker (political actor) seeks legitimization of his actions by alerting the addressee to the proximity or imminence of phenomena which can be a "threat" to the addressee (and the speaker, too) and thus require immediate reaction. Thus, we see that Bush deals with, or describes the Iraqi alleged "threats" and "danger" as a "physically close phenomenon (spatial proximization) (ibid). To make it clear, see the excerpts below in which Bush narrates to his audience that the "threat" may be physically close to them.

23. Our effort to safeguard the homeland includes tighter security at the borders and ports of entry. We have posted more than 50,000 newly trained Federal screeners at airports. We have begun inoculating troops and first-responders against smallpox.

(February 15, 2003)

24. The attacks of September the 11th, 2001, showed what the enemies of America did with four airplanes. We will not wait to see what terrorists or terror states could do with weapons of mass destruction. We are determined to confront "threat" wherever they arise.

(March 8, 2003)

25. America in 2002 continued our efforts to confront the danger of terrorism. We increased the security of our ports and coasts and airlines, and created a new Department of Homeland Security.

(December 28, 2002)

26. Raising the threat level also informs the general public to be more alert to their surroundings and prepared for possible emergencies in the event of an attack.

(February 15, 2003)

Thus, when mentioning *tighter security at the borders and ports of entry* and *the security of our ports and coasts and airlines* , etc., Bush strengthens the appeals of fear within American people through urging them to imagine that the destruction and threat are so close and surrounding them and may happen at any time. By this type of rhetoric, Bush justifies announcing war and going to Iraq.

To gain legitimacy for his immediate and future military action, Bush applies the notion of fear by alerting the audience of the imminence of the danger which may be transferred to America's lands and skies as it is mentioned in the excerpts above. This is confirmed especially when Bush, as in the excerpts below, urges America to go to Iraq to launch a war against it as this is the best way to prevent

"threats" and "dangers" arrive America which is one of the strategies used to help to a high extent legitimizing what is called "pre-emptive war" (an intentionally recognized right to use military force against an "imminent threat" in such a way to significantly lower the threshold to military action) (Dunmire 2007:19) against Iraq as being the source of threat and destruction to America and the world, and also as America' duty to keep America and the world to stop this threat.

27. We're committed to defending the Nation. Yet wars are not won on the defensive. The best way to keep America safe from terrorism is to go after terrorists where they plan and hide. And that work goes on around the world.

(November 16, 2002)

Cap (www.geocities.com/strus_pl/Proximization.pdf, Pp 13-14) proposes an elaborated model of proximization involving the complementary, temporal and axiological, aspects. Cap (www.geocities.com/strus_pl/Legitimization_ Introduction.pdf:4) defines temporal proximization as an aspect "construing the events which take place in the spatial dimension as momentous and historic and hence of central significance to the discourse addressee, as well as to the speaker". (return to examples 23, 24, 25 and 26). Thus, in terms of Aristotle' s theory of fear (Richardson 2007: 160), we see that Bush has been putting into apply the notion of fear by alerting the audience of the spatial and temporal closeness of "threat" and by the unknown form of that "threat".

3. 2. Aristotle's Rhetoric

This section is concerned with applying Aristotle's three divisions of rhetoric (Cited in Richardson 2007: 157) to Bush's presidential speeches. Richardson argues that Aristotle identified three varieties of rhetorical discourse: "forensic or

legal rhetoric; epideictic or ceremonial rhetoric; and deliberative or political rhetoric". He states that each one of these types of rhetoric has certain rhetorical goals (to have audience fear and to legitimize the war) and, that is, focuses on "special topics in articulating, and specific means in fulfilling such goals".

Thus, before introducing the principal features of Aristotle 's theory and practice of rhetoric, we need to survey his definition of rhetoric: "Rhetoric may be defined as the faculty of observing in any given case with available means of persuasion. It is a political facility whose function is not simply to succeed in persuading, but rather to discover the persuasive facts in each case, to present them in such a way that they convince an audience and thereby to provoke them into an immediate or future course of action" (Quoted from Richardson 2007:156).

As far as the varieties of Aristotle's rhetorical discourse are concerned, in forensic rhetoric, the arguer or the rhetor describes someone's or something's past actions. He either "condemns" or "defends" someone's past actions. Thus, this type of rhetoric deals with the past and it depends on "accusation" and "defense" as the ways for that, and the topics it focuses on are "the justice and injustice of actions committed by the defendant". Epideictic rhetoric deals with the "admiration" and "approval" of someone's present actions. Thus, it focuses on or describes the present, "its means are praise and censure, and its special topics are honor and dishonor". Epideictic rhetoric is concerned with "the character of those referred ". The arguer or rhetor tries to have audience "admire" those referred because of their good works or "dislike" them because of their bad works. The third type of rhetoric is the deliberative or political rhetoric. In this type of rhetoric, the rhetor seeks to make audience desire a future decision – often a political decision. Thus, it prescribes

the future, "its means are inducement and dissuasion, and its special topics are the advantages and the disadvantages" (ibid).

The following two points identify the divisions of rhetorical discourse and then apply them to Bush's speeches to see how Bush's rhetorical discourse makes use of these types of rhetoric to provoke the audience into an immediate or future course of actions due to their feeling of fear from past and present fearful actions.

3. 2. 1. Descriptive Argument in Forensic and Epideictic Rhetoric

Fairclough (www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/staff/norman/Blair.doc: P.3) states that one of the means of legitimation is to argue from "descriptions" to "prescription". In terms of Aristotle's Rhetoric, "description" is realized by forensic and epidictic rhetoric. Accordingly, this section is devoted to analyze some randomly selected excerpts from Bush's speeches. In forensic discourse, as it is already presented, the rhetor describes someone's past actions (Richardson, 2007:157). The rhetor or arguer either "condemns" or "defends" past actions of someone depending on "accusation" or "defense" of someone. Similarly, Abuaisha (www.law.ed .ac.uk/ahrc /files/72_gibsonculturaldiversitybiodiversity03.pdf, P.64) states that, "in forensic discourse, orators address juries who are institutionally authorized to make decisions about past events as well as listeners who do not have the right to decide but who can be influenced". See the following excerpts as examples of forensic rhetorical discourse:

28. He <u>has broken</u> every pledge he made to the United Nations and the world since his invasion of Kuwait was rolled back in 1991. Sixteen times the United Nations Security Council has passed resolutions designed to ensure that Iraq does

not pose a threat to international peace and security. Saddam Hussein <u>has violated</u> every one of these 16 resolutions, not once but many times.

And although the regime <u>agreed</u> in 1991 to destroy and stop developing all weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles, it <u>has broken</u> every aspect of this fundamental pledge.

September 14, 2002

29. Iraq <u>has already used</u> weapons of mass death against another country and against its own citizens. … And for more than a decade, that regime <u>has answered</u> Security Council resolutions with defiance and bad faith and deception.

September 28, 2002

Here, Bush uses the discourse of fear or has audience start feeling fear from Iraq or Saddam Hussein. He sheds the light on Saddam Hussein or Iraq's past actions as a first step for future plans or actions that America may or will take in future against Iraq. In his rhetorical discourse, Bush condemns and refers to Iraq's past actions as unjust through accusing Iraq of ordering a chemical weapons attack on another country and its own citizens. In another excerpts, Bush accuses Saddam Hussein of breaking every pledge he made to the United Nations and the world "since his invasion of Kuwait was rolled back in 1991".

Thus, Dunmire (2007:26) affirms that such tropos of fear and threat "functions to create a feeling of insecurity within the in-group, while simultaneously vilifying the out-group". Bush evokes the feeling of fear towards Saddam Hussein or Iraq through using legitimizing discourse to rhetorically justify what future decisions America takes against Iraq. In

addition, what is noted in Bush's rhetorical discourse in general and in his forensic rhetoric in particular is his frequent use of the perfective as a way of condemning Iraq's past actions. Quirk & Greenbuam (1973:44) states that the perfection has an ability "to involve a span of time from earliest memory to the present, the perfection has an indefiniteness which makes it an appropriate verbal expression for introducing a topic of discourse. As the topic is narrowed down, the emerging definiteness is marked by the simple past as well as in the noun phrases. Thus, through his frequent use of the present perfect rather than the simple past as a way of fulfilling forensic rhetoric, Bush introduces topics of discourse as new and not known to audience in an attempt to evoke their fear of Iraq's ability and intention of doing what has already done in case Iraq is not stopped. Bush condemns past actions committed by Iraq as unjust and as forming danger and threat to the international community in general and to America in particular.

In epideictic rhetoric, the arguer or rhetor describes the present. He either directs praise or censure to someone, and the topics he depends on to fulfill the goals in questions is "honor" or "dishonor". Epideictic rhetoric, as it was already mentioned, describes "the character of those referred". As a result of the rhetorical discourse of the arguer, the audience either 'admire" those referred to because of their good actions or "dislike" them because of their bad actions. See the following excerpts:

3o. The Iraqi regime <u>continues</u> to support terrorist groups and to oppress its civilian population. It <u>refuses</u> to account for missing Gulf war personnel or to end illicit trade outside the U.N.'s oil-for-food program.

<u>Today</u>, this regime likely <u>maintains</u> stockpiles of chemical and biological agents and <u>is improving and expanding</u>

facilities capable of producing chemical and biological weapons. Today, Saddam Hussein has the scientists and infrastructure for a nuclear weapons program and has illicitly sought to purchase the equipment needed to enrich uranium for a nuclear weapon.

September 14, 2002

31. The Iraqi regime possesses biological and chemical weapons, is rebuilding the facilities to make more and, according to the British Government, could launch a biological or chemical attack in as little as 45 minutes after the order is given. The regime has longstanding and continuing ties to terrorist groups, …. This regime is seeking a nuclear bomb and with fissile material could build one within a year.

September 28, 2002

32. … Iraq could use its weapons of mass destruction

March 1, 2003

Here, and other excerpts, Bush, by his speech, tries to distort Iraq's picture in the public eye. He describes Iraq's present actions (alleged possession of biological and chemical weapons and Iraq's support to terrorist group) as dishonored ones. Bush direct censure to Iraq when he states "*This regime is seeking a nuclear bomb and with fissile material could build one within a year*". This bad and awful description of Iraq's present actions, in turn, evokes the sense of threat and danger Iraq poses to the world if an immediate future action will not take place against Iraq. In addition, this feeling of fear mentally prepares them to accept without challenge the military future decision against Iraq as a legally legitimized decision. Thus, through describing Iraq as continuing to support terrorist groups, maintaining stockpiles

of chemical and biological agents, having the scientists and infrastructure for a nuclear weapons program and according to the British Government, could launch a biological or chemical attack in as little as 45 minutes after the order is given, etc., Bush not only persuades audience of the information presented , but rather to have people fear of the threat and danger of the alleged nuclear weapons program and the alleged connection between the Iraq and the terrorist groups. Thus, Bush seeks to make audience, because of their fear of danger, desire a quick future decision – often a political decision to stop this threat. So, the means (deceptive and misleading techniques of information presented to his audience) and the legitimizing discourse that Bush uses in his rhetorical speech functions well to help justify and legitimize, without challenge, the decision of the American war on Iraq.

3. 2. 2. Prescriptive Argument in Deliberative Rhetoric

After discussing descriptions of past actions (specifically the wrongness of Iraq's past actions) through the use of forensic rhetoric, and descriptions of Iraq's present actions as dishonored ones (descriptions that discuss the character or reputation in the public eye) through the use of epideictic rhetoric, Bush shifts to prescribe the future. He gives prescriptions of the future through his use of deliberative rhetoric which concerns with the future. Deliberative rhetoric is characterized by the political use of "must" and "will" modality expressing the obligatory and certainty nature of the American future decision (For more details, See Section 4). Thus, Bush, after giving descriptions of past and present actions, was able to achieve his goal: to plant and intensify the feeling of fear in audience who are being mentally prepared to easily accept important political decisions against Iraq (future military action). Thus, to make audience completely and finally prepared to accept without challenge the decision of American war on Iraq, Bush shifts to a new type of legitimizing discourse when he adopts a

deliberative mode of address. In deliberative rhetoric, the rhetor works deliberatively to obtain the acceptance of a decision- often a political decision (Richardson 2007:157). Richardson states that this type of rhetoric deals with the future. It prescribes the future. The rhetor either induces or dissuades on the basis of "advantages" and "disadvantages" of the decision. Richardson states "when he adopting a deliberative mode of address, the rhetor prescribes that audience do or not to do something based on the expediency or harmfulness of a proposed course of action: if he urges its acceptance, he does so on the ground that it will do good; if he urges its rejection, he does so on the ground that it will do harm. Clearly, deliberative rhetoric only concerns itself with such things that ultimately depend on ourselves, and which we have it in our power to set going (ibid). See the following excerpts:

33. We have seen far too many instances in the past decade, from Bosnia to Rwanda to Kosovo, where the failure of the Security Council to act decisively has led to tragedy. <u>And we must recognize that some threats are so grave and their potential consequences so terrible that they must be removed, even if it requires military force.</u>

March, 15 2003

Here, in his deliberative mode of address, Bush seeks the desirability of a decision – using military force. Bush tries to induce audience of the advantages of taking such a decision (deliberative rhetoric) where it will stop the grave threats surrounding them realized in Iraq's possession of MDW and Iraq's connection to terrorist groups (discussed in forensic and epideictic) rhetoric, and to stop the terrible potential consequences of this threat if an immediate or future action will not take place.

34. The attacks of September the 11th, 2001, showed what the enemies of America did with four airplanes. <u>We will not wait to see what terrorists or terror states could do with weapons of mass destruction. We are determined to confront threats wherever they arise. And as a last resort, we must be willing to use military force.</u>

March, 8 2003

Similarly, in this excerpt, Bush urges audience to accept the decision of using the military force against Iraq (deliberative rhetoric) based on the expediency of this decision as a last resort to confront threats and dangers (presented in describing Iraq's past actions, and Iraq's present intentions and the character of those who rule it).

35. Yet, resolutions mean little without resolve, and <u>the United States, along with a growing coalition of nations, will take whatever action is necessary to defend ourselves and disarm the Iraqi regime.</u>

February 8, 2003

36. America is determined to enforce the demands of the United Nations Security Council by confronting the grave and growing danger of Iraq and weapons of mass destruction. <u>Iraq will not be allowed to intimidate and blackmail the civilized world or to supply his terrible weapons to terrorist groups who would not hesitate to use them against us. The safety of the American people depends on ending this threat.</u>

March 1, 2003

Moreover, these excerpts implicate that Bush intends to use the military force against Iraq and he encourages

audience to agree with him (deliberative rhetoric) upon this decision which is based on the advantages of defending the American people and the world from the threats and dangers represented by Iraq's past actions (forensic rhetoric), his alleged possession of MDW and alleged Iraq's connection to terrorists groups (epideictic rhetoric) who, as it is mentioned in Bush's speeches, would not hesitate to use MDW if they are passed to them or if Iraq is not disarmed.

Similar to Aristotle 's theory or division of rhetorical discourse is Fairclough's argument from "is" to "must", "from descriptions (narratives) of the world and world change to prescriptions for policy, from actualities to imaginaries" (www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/staff/norman/Blair.doc, P.3). Here, it is shown that political actors shift from presenting descriptions of someone's past and present actions into presenting "prescriptions for policy", that is, to be adopted and followed in order to justify and legitimize any decision about future actions and plans (Richardson, 2007:157). See the following excerpts:

37. We know Iraq is actively seeking the destructive technologies to match his hatred. And we know that Iraq must be stopped.

September 28, 2002

38. The world is also uniting to answer the unique and urgent threat posed by Iraq, that has already used weapons of mass destruction to kill thousands. We must not and will not permit either terrorists or tyrants to blackmail freedom-loving nations.

November 23, 2002

39. Good morning. This weekend is the deadline for the Iraqi regime to fully disclose to the U.N. Security Council all of

***its weapons of mass destruction. Disarming that regime is a central commitment of the war on terror. We must, and we will, prevent terrorist groups and outlaw regimes from threatening the American people with catastrophic harm*.**

December 7, 2002

40.The attacks of September the 11th, 2001, showed what the enemies of America did with four airplanes. We will not wait to see what terrorists or terror states could do with weapons of mass destruction. We are determined to confront threats wherever they arise. And as a last resort, we must be willing to use military force.

March 8, 2003

In these excerpts, Bush's legitimizing discourse, within the same statement or text, varies from threatening audience of the Iraqi policy's past action (forensic rhetoric), to portraying Iraq's present threat to America and the world (epideictic rhetoric), to legitimizing the obligation and necessity of the American war against Iraq or what is called "the preemption policy" (deliberative rhetoric). Thus, the rhetorical goal of such rhetorical types of statement is to gain the audience support and acceptance for future actions. In other words, we see that Bush threatens the audience with a world in which the Iraqi policy character, WMD and enemies may or will bring destruction to America and the world.

Bush, through the use of epistemic and deontic modality "must", "will", etc., (the focus of the next section), strengthens the certain and obligatory nature of American decisive military action against Iraq which ensures security and freedom and stop living in a "world of fear".

4. The political Use of Modality in Bush's Presidential Discourse

Modality is defined as "the expression of possibility, probability, necessity -- sentence types in which a proposition is not asserted" (www.hku.hk/linguist/program/semantics6.html, P.1)

Asserted proposition: this film is boring
Modalised proposition: this film may/could/must be boring

Richardson (2007:59) argues that modality refers to judgments, comment and attitude in text and talk, and in particular, modality refers to the speaker's or writer's commitment to his claim, assertion and proposals. Richardson (ibid:60) quotes from Simpson (1993:47) that "modality refers broadly to a speaker's attitude towards, or opinion about, the truth of a proposition expressed by a sentence. It also extends to their attitude towards the situation or event described by a sentence". He also adds that modality "not only links between form" and content but also between content and function". Modality is marked by the use of modal verbs (such as may, should, will, and must). Thus, modality not only describes an event but also represents the writer's viewpoint of the content (ibid: 60). Richardson goes further to argue that modality may be expressed in two principal forms: truth modality (epistemic) and obligation or duty modality (deontic). "The epistemic system is associated with ‘the speaker’s confidence or lack of confidence’ (i.e.subjectivity) ‘in the truth of a proposition expressed" (www.nottingham.ac.uk/english/nlc/badran.PDF, P.49). Richardson (2007:59) states that truth (epistemic) modality shifts from 'the absolutely categorical (This war will be stopped if the people intervene in the political process) to "varying degrees of hedging" (This war can be stopped if the people intervene in the political process) and "reduced certainty" (This war could be stopped if Only the people

intervened in the political process). Obligation or deontic modality, in Richardson's view, "refers to future events and, specifically, the degree to which the speaker/ writer believes that a certain decision ought or should be taken", and similarly Neal and Bernard (2006:13) quote from Groefsema (1995:53) that deontic modality "modalizes the lexical verbs of political statement, and therefore, the degree of judgment and obligation". Obligation modality is characterized by its categorical nature (children's rights must take precedence over the profit motive of private-sector companies) or more cautiously (children's rights ought to take precedence over the profit motive of private sector companies) Richardson (2007:60).

Murry Edelman (1971, 1988) (Cited in Dunmire 2007:21) repeats Aristotle 's viewpoint concerning in the deontic modality of the political discourse stating that it deals with what might, should, or must be done in the future. Edelman also argues that in addition to its characterization by deontic modality, political discourse contains epistemic modality which has the role of asserting what will be in future. Thus, after setting plans and proposals about future actions, political actors confirm and intensify these plans of future proposals by making "claims, assertion, and declarations concerning the future realities that give rise to and are implicated in those actions". Edelman adds that making proposals about future actions and policies is considered as " a rhetorical act through which political actors make rhetorical evocations of a remote time unlikely to arrive; these evocations, in turn, have material effects by legitimizing more immediate proposals and policies which serve the partisan 's political goals and interests (p.21).

In our data of analysis, America's role of making a future decision to preempt any type of threat that America may face in present time or will face in future has been indicated, once, through the frequent use of an epistemic modal "will" of

certainty and futurity by which the American future decision or plan (using military force against Iraq) "are presupposed" (See Dunmire 2007:25) and , second, through using a deontic modal "must" by which the future military action against Iraq becomes an obligation and necessity, and a last option to stop living in a "world of fear" and to ensure a world of security and freedom as it presented in Bush 's excerpts. What is noted in several excerpts of Bush's political discourse is a shift from a deontic modality "must" which obligates the American military future decision against Iraq to an epistemic modality "will" to refer the certainty, reality and futurity of that decision and other plans. These two modals presuppose and obligate or obligate and then fix the certainty of this obligation of the American war on Iraq as a necessity rather than choice " *And as a last resort, we must be willing to use military force"* since this is what preempts and prevents "threats" and "dangers" posed by the ideas presented in the forensic and epideictic rhetorical: Iraq's past actions, Iraq's alleged possession of MDW, and Iraq's alleged connection to terrorist groups. Note that all modal verbs that are not related to our topic in question have been excluded from our analysis. In other words, all of Bush's presidential speeches that talk about America's domestic affairs and what they contain of modals have been excluded from the analysis.

4. 1. Must

"Must" plays strong individual roles in expressing political intention. "Must" occurred as deontic modality 29 times and were categorized into three motifs:

1. Encouraging Audience for political decision/resolution. (20)
2. Obligatory nature of the American resolution. (5)
3. Iraqi people rights and freedom. (2)
4. Insistence on defeating terrorists/enemies. (2)

1. **Encouraging Audience for Political Decision/Resolution to Stop Threat:**

There were 20 uses of this motif encouraging audience to take a decisive political resolution to preempt any type of threat. See the following excerpts:

41. Congress <u>must</u> make it unmistakably clear that when it comes to confronting the growing danger posed by Iraq's efforts to develop or acquire weapons of mass destruction, the status quo is totally unacceptable.

September 14, 2002

42. … because they know from the hard experience of the 20th century, that threats to freedom <u>must</u> be opposed, not ignored or appeased.

November 23, 2002

43. And we <u>must</u> recognize that some threats are so grave and their potential consequences so terrible that they <u>must</u> be removed, even if it requires military force.

March 15, 2003

44. The issue is straightforward: We <u>must</u> choose between a world of fear or a world of progress. We <u>must</u> stand up for our security and for the demands of human dignity. By heritage and choice, the United States <u>will</u> make that stand. The world community <u>must</u> do so as well.

September 14, 2002

45. We cannot leave the future of peace and the security of America in the hands of Iraq. Iraq <u>must</u> be disarmed, and all the United Nations resolutions against its support for terrorism <u>must</u> be enforced.

September 28, 2002

46. We know that Iraq must be stopped.

October 5, 2002

In these and other excerpts, the American resolution of the necessity of stopping whatever type of threat and danger (in this case, the Iraqi threat) gained obligation through the political use of the obligation modality "must" and then this obligatory nature of the American resolution gained certainty and futurity of action through a shift into using the epistemic modality "will" of certainty and reality as in excerpt (44).

2. Obligatory Nature of the American and U.N. Resolutions:

There were 5 uses of this motif in which America urges audience of the necessity of following the American resolution.

47. This week, both the House and Senate passed strong bipartisan measures authorizing the use of force in Iraq if it becomes necessary. Our country and our Congress are now united in purpose. America is speaking with one voice: Iraq must disarm and comply with all existing U.N. resolutions, or it will be forced to comply.

October 12, 2002

48. Iraq must now, without delay or negotiations, give up its weapons of mass destruction, welcome full inspections, and fundamentally change the approach it has taken for more than a decade. The regime must allow immediate and unrestricted access to every site, every document, and every person identified by inspectors. Iraq can be certain that the old game of cheat-and-retreat, tolerated at other times, will no longer be tolerated.

November 9, 2002

3. Iraqi People Rights and Freedom:

There were 2 use of this motif referring to the Iraqi people rights and freedom. See the following excerpt:

49. All Iraqis <u>must</u> have a voice in the new Government, and all citizens <u>must</u> have their rights protected.

March 1, 2003

4. Insistence on Defeating "Terrorists"/ "Enemies":

There were 2 uses of this motif referring to American insistence on defeating the terrorist and winning the battle.

49. we <u>must</u>, and we <u>will</u>, prevent terrorist groups and outlaw regimes from threatening the American people with catastrophic harm.

December 7, 2002

50. we <u>must</u> not, <u>will</u> not permit either terrorists or tyrants to blackmail freedom loving nations.

November 23, 2002

4. 2. <u>Should</u>

The modal auxiliary "should" has been used three times. One as an epistemic modality and two as deontic modality referring to (Encouraging audience for political decision/resolution). See the following excerpt as an example:

51. <u>Should</u> force be required to bring Iraq to account.

October 5, 2002

4. 3. Will

"will" as a modal auxiliary referring to certainty, reality, and futurity of the American decision and action has been used for 61 times. 56 uses of "will" have been categorized as (certainty of the American future decision and resolution). See the following excerpts:

52. With the United Nations Security Council resolution passed yesterday, the world has now come together to say that the … regime in Iraq will not be permitted to build or possess chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. That is the judgment of the United Nations Security Council. That is the judgment of the United States Congress. And my administration will see to it that the world's judgment is enforced.

November 9, 2002

53. America will confront gathering dangers. By showing our resolve today, we are building a future of peace.

December 7, 2002

54. In 2002, the war on terror that began with the liberation of Afghanistan continued on many fronts. Working with our allies around the world, we captured top al Qaeda leaders, destroyed terror training camps and froze millions of dollars in terrorist assets.

In the new year, we will prosecute the war on terror with patience and focus and determination. With the help of a broad coalition, we will make certain that terrorists and their supporters are not safe in any cave or corner of the world.

December 28, 2002

In these and other excerpts, Bush increases the certainty of the American war on Iraq through pragmatically presupposing it. In excerpt (54), Bush, when stating " ***In the new year, we will prosecute the war on terror with patience and focus and determination. … we will make certain that terrorists and their supporters are not safe*** **…" , deliberately manipulates his audience's minds by having them suppose that, in the new year, there will be a war. Here Bush, through his rhetorical discourse, controls his audience's social cognition and makes his audience's minds mentally preferred to accept without challenge the speaker's intentions (See Al-Mahdawi and Hummadi 2009).**

Two uses of "will" have been categorized as referring to (certainty of the Iraqi authorities' actions against America). See the following excerpts:

55. By then, Iraq will have had the means to terrorize and dominate the region.

September 28, 2002

56. and we have every reason to believe Iraq will use them (WMD) again.

October 5, 2002

One use of "will" has been categorized as referring to the (certainty of the Iraqi people human rights". See the following excerpt:

57. … the united states will work with other nations to help the Iraqi people rebuild and form a just government.

October 5, 2002

4. 4. "Could"

There were 8 uses of "could" modality. Five uses were categorized to refer to the hedging and mitigation of the Iraqi threat and danger to America. In other words, the ability of Iraq to threaten America has been couched and mitigated. Richardson (2007:61) emphasizes that the claims that concentrated on Iraq's ability to pose "threat" to America were "so often couched, hedged and mitigated to be almost devoid of any real content". See the following excerpts:

58. This resolution requires Iraq to fully and unconditionally disarm itself of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons materials, as well as the prohibited missiles that could be used to deliver them.

The attacks of September the 11th, 2001, showed what the enemies of America did with four airplanes. We will not wait to see what terrorists or terror states could do with weapons of mass destruction. We are determined to confront threats wherever they arise. And as a last resort, we must be willing to use military force.

March 8, 2003

59. … Iraq could use his weapons of mass destruction.

March 8, 2003

6o. By then, the Iraqi dictator will have had the means to terrorize and dominate the region, and each passing day could be the one on which the Iraqi regime gives anthrax or VX nerve gas or, someday, a nuclear weapon to a terrorist group.

September 28, 2002

Thus, according to Richardson (2007: 61), these statements point out that Iraq "may" be able to pose "threat" to America. In other words, the "threat" of Iraq to America was not given certainty. Simultaneously, Richardson states that the likelihood of the Iraqi action that is represented by "could" paradoxically heightens the sense of dread and "threat" (P.60) since it leaves things ambiguous. This ambiguity accompanied with "threat" provokes audience to accept without challenge future decision (in our study: an immediate or future action against Iraq) or to accept the content of what so called "the preemptive war" (Dunmire 2007:20) which finally, as this is the essence of our study, gives legitimacy to the American war on Iraq.

5. Conclusion

It is concluded that appeals of fear, represented through deception, false pretensions and misleading techniques of presenting information to audience (exactly the alleged Iraq's possession of WMD and the alleged Iraq's connection to "terrorist groups"), play a great role in modeling the audience's social cognition to easily accept decisions. In other words, political actors make audience portrait a close and imminent threat that surrounds the audience, arousing their negative associations to achieve certain political ends. Thus, George W. Bush heavily depends on the discourse of "the Iraqi threat and danger" to have audience fear of imminent destruction that may or will happen to America which in turn helps him persuade the audience of the necessity and obligation of the war against Iraq as the only means to stop this "threat". In addition, modality plays an important role in achieving the political goals of the political actors. Bush frequently uses modality to fix the certainty, reality and futurity of the American war against Iraq and then to intensify the necessity and obligation of the war as a last option to stop living in a "world of fear" represented by Iraq's control on the world through the alleged possession of WMD and the alleged connection to "terrorist groups", and to ensure a "world of security and freedom".

Bibliography

- Abuaisha, Husam (2003) "The Rhetoric of the ‘War on Terror": The Ideological Subjectivity of America/Israel vs. Iraq - - - Palestine. Available at: www.law.ed.ac.uk/ahrc/files/72_gibsonculturaldiversitybiodiversity03.pdf

- Al-Mahdawi & Hummadi (2009) "Persuasive Appeals in Editorial Discourse". Al-Anbar University Journal for Humanities, Volume 4, No. 2. Pp: 17-31.

- Badran, Dany "Modality and Ideology in Translated Political Texts". Available at: www. nottingham.ac.uk/english/nlc/badran.PDF

- Cap Piotr "Legitimization in Political Discourse: A Cross-Disciplinary Perspective on the Modern US War Rhetoric". Available at: www.geocities.com/strus_pl/Legitimization_Introduction.pdf

- __________"Legitimization in Political Discourse: A Pragmatic-Cognitive Perspective on the Iraq War Rhetoric". Available at: www.geocities.com/strus_pl/Proximization.pdf

- Connor, U & Gladkov, K. Rhetorical Appeals in Fundraising Direct Mail Letters. In Connor, U &

Upton, A. (ed.) (2004) Discourse in the Profession: Perspectives from Corpus Linguistics. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

- Dunmire, patricia (2007) "Emerging Threats" and "Coming Dangers'; Claiming the Future for Preventive War". In Discourse, War and Terrorism: Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture. Hodge, Adam and Nilep, Chad (eds). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

- Fairclough, Norman "Blair’s contribution to elaborating a new ‘doctrine of international community". Available at: www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/staff/norman/Blair.doc

- N.A. "Modality and Evidentiality". Available at: http://www.hku.hk/linguist/program/semantics6.html

- Neal, Waddell, and Bernard, McKenna (2006) "Mediated political Responses to 2005 London Bombing: Deontics and Epideictics". Available at: www.allacademic.com/meta/p92020_index.html

- Quirk, Randolph & Greenbaum, Sidney (1973) A University Grammar of English. England: Longman.

- Richardson, john (2007) <u>Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis</u>. Palgravea.

- Thomas, J. (1995) <u>Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics</u>. London: Longman Group Ltd.

- Van Dijk, Teun A. (2005) "War rhetoric of a little ally: Political implicatures and Aznar's legitimatization of the war in Iraq". Journal of Language and Politics 4:(1): Available at: www.discourses.org/OldArticles/War rhetoric of a little ally.pdf

……………………………………….

- <u>Speeches</u>

George W. Bush's Radio Addresses (*September 14, 2002 to March 22, 2003). Available at:* http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/satradio.php